



UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT BRANCH
Washington, D.C. 20570

Via email

November 28, 2022

Re: FOIA Request NLRB-2023-000317

Dear Celeste Willow:

This is in response to your request, under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. § 552, received on November 14, 2022, in which you seek all documents from *Menard, Inc.*, Case Nos. 18-CA-288191, 18-CA-292411, and 18-CA-300169. You assumed financial responsibility for the processing of your request in the amount of \$37.00.

We acknowledged your request on November 14, 2022.

Your request is denied in part and granted in part, as explained below.

After conducting a search of the Agency's electronic casehandling system, NxGen, I have determined that certain records responsive to your request for documents for Case Nos. 18-CA-288191 and 18-CA-292411 are part of investigative files in open cases before the Agency, and therefore, are exempt from disclosure pursuant to Exemption 7(A) of the FOIA. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(A). Exemption 7(A) allows an agency to withhold records included in an open investigatory file where disclosure could reasonably be expected to interfere with enforcement proceedings. See *NLRB v. Robbins Tire & Rubber Co.*, 437 U.S. 214, 236 (1978). Therefore, given the still open status of the requested cases, the investigatory records in the case files are being withheld in full at this time pursuant to Exemption 7(A).

Your request is granted to the extent that I have attached the formal records in Case Nos. 18-CA-288191 and 18-CA-292411, which are available to the public pursuant to NLRB FOIA regulations. Upon my review, redactions have been made to portions of these records to protect the privacy interests of individuals named in the records. These redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C).

Please note that Exemption 7(A) protection is “temporal in nature.” *Citizens for Responsibility & Ethics in Wash. v. Dep’t of Justice*, 746 F.3d 1082, 1097 (D.C. Cir 2014) (citing *NLRB v. Robbins Tire*, 437 U.S. 214, 223-24 230-32 (1978)). As such, case file records may become disclosable, subject to applicable exemptions, after each case closes, that is, once a Board decision and/or court order issues, there has been full compliance with a settlement, or each case has otherwise been closed under Agency procedures. Accordingly, you may wish to file a new request at that time.

The status of these cases can be tracked on the Agency website at www.nlr.gov by going to the Cases & Decisions tab, clicking case search, entering the case number for each case in the search box and viewing the case page for each case, or by clicking the links here: www.nlr.gov/case/18-CA-288191 and www.nlr.gov/case/18-CA-292411.

Regarding Case No. 18-CA-300169, which is closed, a search of the Agency’s electronic casehandling system, NxGen, was conducted. This search yielded 26 pages of responsive, releasable records, which are attached. Included in this release is a blank, auto-generated casehandling log form. While this form has no informational value, I am including it in the interests of completeness and clarity, as its release poses no foreseeable harm to the Agency’s internal processes.

After a review, I have determined that portions of the records from this case are exempt from disclosure under Exemptions 6 and 7(C) of the FOIA (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6) and (b)(7)(C)). Specifically, redactions have been made to the records to protect the privacy interests of individuals named in the records. These redactions were made pursuant to FOIA Exemption 6, which pertains to information the release of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, and FOIA Exemption 7(C), which pertains to records or information compiled for law enforcement purposes, the release of which could reasonably be expected to constitute an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy. 5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(6), (b)(7)(C).

Other responsive records from this closed case are being withheld in their entirety pursuant to FOIA Exemption 5 (5 U.S.C. § 552(b)(5)). Specifically, 17 pages of records, consisting of draft documents, a memorandum containing recommendations, and records reflecting internal communications concerning the handling of the case, are being withheld.

Exemption 5 allows agencies to withhold “inter-agency or intra-agency memorandums or letters which would not be available by law to a party other than an agency in litigation with the agency,” and covers records that would “normally be privileged in the civil discovery context.” *NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. 132, 149 (1975); *Tax Analysts v. IRS*, 117 F.3d 607, 616 (D.C. Cir.

1997). The deliberative process and the attorney work-product privileges are two of the primary privileges incorporated into Exemption 5.

The deliberative process privilege protects the internal decision-making processes of government agencies to safeguard the quality of agency decisions. *Competitive Enter. Inst. v. OSTP*, 161 F. Supp.3d 120, 128 (D.D.C. 2016). The basis for this privilege is to protect and encourage the creative debate and candid discussion of alternatives. *Jordan v. U.S. Dep't. of Justice*, 591 F.2d 753, 772 (D.C. Cir.1978). Two fundamental requirements must be satisfied before an agency may properly withhold a record pursuant to the deliberative process privilege. First, the record must be predecisional, *i.e.*, prepared in order to assist an agency decision-maker in arriving at the decision. *Renegotiation Bd. v. Grumman Aircraft Eng'g Corp.*, 421 U.S. 168, 184 (1975); *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d 141, 151 (D.C. Cir. 2006). Second, the record must be deliberative, *i.e.*, "it must form a part of the agency's deliberative process in that it makes recommendations or expresses opinions on legal or policy matters." *Judicial Watch, Inc. v. FDA*, 449 F.3d at 151 (quoting *Coastal States Gas Corp. v. U.S. Dep't of Energy*, 617 F.2d 854, 866 (D.C. Cir. 1980)). To satisfy these requirements, the agency need not "identify a specific decision in connection with which a memorandum is prepared. Agencies are . . . engaged in a continuing process of examining their policies; this process will generate memoranda containing recommendations which do not ripen into agency decisions; and the lower courts should be wary of interfering with this process." *Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 421 U.S. at 151 n.18 (1975). Moreover, the protected status of a predecisional record is not altered by the subsequent issuance of a decision, *see, e.g., Fed. Open Mkt. Comm. v. Merrill*, 443 U.S. 340, 360 (1979); *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DHS*, 384 F. Supp. 2d 100, 112-13 (D.D.C. 2005) or by the agency opting not to make a decision. *See Judicial Watch, Inc. v. Clinton*, 880 F. Supp. 1, 13 (D.D.C. 1995), *aff'd*, 76 F.3d 1232 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (citing *Russell v. U.S. Dep't of the Air Force*, 682 F.2d 1045 (D.C. Cir. 1982)).

The attorney work-product privilege protects records and other memoranda that reveal an attorney's mental impressions and legal theories that were prepared by an attorney, or a non-attorney supervised by an attorney, in contemplation of litigation. *See United States v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 239 n.13 (1975); *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495, 509-10 (1947). The attorney work-product privilege extends to records prepared in anticipation of both pending litigation and foreseeable litigation and even when no specific claim is contemplated at the time the attorney prepared the material. *Schiller v. NLRB*, 964 F.2d 1205, 1208 (D.C. Cir. 1992). Furthermore, the privilege protects any part of a record prepared in anticipation of litigation, not just the portions concerning opinions and legal theories, *see Judicial Watch v. U.S. Dep't of Justice*, 432 F.3d 366, 371 (D.C. Cir. 2005), and is intended to protect an attorney's opinions, thoughts, impressions, interpretations, analyses and strategies. *Id.*; *see also Wolfson v. United States*, 672 F. Supp.2d 20, 29 (D.D.C. 2009). *See Judicial Watch*, 432

F.3d at 371 (finding that an agency need not segregate and disclose non-exempt material if a record is fully protected as work product). Additionally, the protection provided by Exemption 5 for attorney work-product records is not subject to defeat even if a requester could show a substantial need for the information and undue hardship in obtaining it from another source. See *FTC v. Grolier, Inc.*, 462 U.S. 19, 28 (1983). Further, protection against the disclosure of work product records extends even after litigation is terminated. *Id.*

Here, the responsive records being withheld meet the requirements for Exemption 5 protection under both the deliberative process and attorney work-product privileges. They are internal and predecisional. They reflect the views of the General Counsel and her Regional staff concerning policies and strategies in the processing of the unfair labor practice cases. Since they contain proposed legal strategy, these internal casehandling records clearly reflect the deliberative and consultative process of the Agency that Exemption 5 protects from disclosure. *Sears, Roebuck and Co.*, 421 U.S. at 150-52. Additionally, the content of the records is also attorney work-product, as it reflects legal analysis and/or opinions of the General Counsel's staff and was created to assist superiors in their decision-making process, in anticipation of possible litigation. Accordingly, the records are being withheld in their entirety.

For the purpose of assessing fees, we have placed you in Category D, the "all other requesters" category, because you do not fall within any of the other fee categories. Consistent with this fee category, you will be assessed charges to recover the reasonable direct costs for searching for the requested records, except that you will not be charged for the first two hours of search. NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(ii)(D). Charges for all categories of requesters are \$9.25 per quarter hour of professional time. 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(d)(2)(i).

Less than two hours of professional time was expended in searching for the requested material. Accordingly, there is no charge assessed for this request.

You may contact William T. Hearne, the FOIA Attorney-Advisor who processed your request, at (202) 273-0139 or by email at william.hearne@nrlb.gov, as well as the Agency's FOIA Public Liaison, for any further assistance and/or to discuss any aspect of your request. The FOIA Public Liaison, in addition to the FOIA Specialist or Attorney-Advisor, can further explain responsive and releasable agency records, suggest agency offices that may have responsive records, and/or discuss how to narrow the scope of a request in order to minimize fees and processing times. The contact information for the FOIA Public Liaison is:

Kristine M. Minami, FOIA Public Liaison
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20570
Email: FOIAPublicLiaison@nrlb.gov
Telephone: (202) 273-0902
Fax: (202) 273-FOIA (3642)

After first contacting the Agency, you may additionally contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA dispute resolution services it offers. The contact information for OGIS is:

Office of Government Information Services
National Archives and Records Administration
8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS
College Park, Maryland 20740-6001
Email: ogis@nara.gov
Telephone: (202) 741-5770
Toll free: (877) 684-6448
Fax: (202) 741-5769

You may obtain a review of this determination under the NLRB Rules and Regulations, 29 C.F.R. § 102.117(c)(2)(v), by filing an administrative appeal with the Division of Legal Counsel (DLC) through FOIAonline at:
<https://foiaonline.gov/foiaonline/action/public/home> or by mail or email at:

Nancy E. Kessler Platt, Chief FOIA Officer
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street, S.E., 4th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20570
Email: DLCFOIAAppeal@nrlb.gov

Any appeal must be postmarked or electronically submitted within 90 days of the date of this letter. Any appeal should contain a complete statement of the reasons upon which it is based.

Please be advised that contacting any Agency official (including the Attorney-Advisor, FOIA Officer, or the FOIA Public Liaison) and/or OGIS does not stop the

FOIA Request NLRB-2023-000317

November 28, 2022

Page 6

90-day appeal clock and is not an alternative or substitute for filing an administrative appeal.

Sincerely,

Synta E. Keeling
FOIA Officer

Attachment: (74 pages)